

REMARKS

Claims 1, 13 and 21 have been amended, while claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-16 and 21-27 remain pending. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejections and, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance.

§ 101 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-16 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13 and 21 in the manner discussed during the interview for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections. Specifically, Applicant has amended each of these independent claims to recite a "processor-readable storage medium." Applicant notes that illustrative and non-limiting examples of storage media are discussed in Applicant's specification at least at paragraph [0078].

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the outstanding rejections.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 21-22, 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,434,520 Kenevsky et al. (hereinafter, "Kenevsky") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,080,392 to Geshwind (hereinafter, "Geshwind").

Claims 3, 11 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kanevsky in view of Geshwind in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,653 to Ellis et al. (hereinafter, “Ellis”).

Claims 6 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kanevsky in view of Geshwind in further view of Schultz U.S. Patent No. 5,737,734 to Schultz (hereinafter, “Schultz”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13 and 21 in the manner discussed during the interview for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejections.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 recites a processor-readable storage medium comprising processor-executable instructions configured for (added language underlined and emphasis added):

- receiving a request for information regarding a media object;
- inferring the information from repeat instances of media objects occurring within one or more media streams; and
- returning the information;
- wherein the inferring comprises comparing temporal lengths of repeat instances of the media object with one another to determine different versions of the media object, the different versions of the media object selected from the group comprising:
 - a longest version of the media object;

- a number of longer versions of the media object;
- a shortest version of the media object; and
- a number of shorter versions of the media object and
- wherein the inferring further comprises determining a number of related media objects, wherein: (i) the related media objects are determined based on **temporal proximities** of media objects relative to the media object associated with the request, and (ii) the related media objects have a **higher frequency of repeat instances** relative to one another.

In making out a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office alleges that Kenevsky and Geshwind render claim 1 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended this claim. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references at least fail to teach or suggest: "wherein the inferring further comprises determining a number of related media objects, wherein: (i) the related media objects are determined based on **temporal proximities** of media objects relative to the media object associated with the request, and (ii) the related media objects have a **higher frequency of repeat instances** relative to one another."

During the afore-mentioned interview, Applicant's attorney understood the Examiners to at least tentatively agree that if Applicant were to make such amendments to independent claim 1, this amended claim would at least overcome the cited references of record. However, the Examiners also indicated that they would need to re-review the references and, potentially, conduct an updated search. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 2-3 and 7-12 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest.

Claim 13 recites a processor-readable storage medium comprising processor-executable instructions configured for (added language underlined and emphasis added):

- receiving a first user input regarding a first media object;
- sending a first request for one or more additional media objects based on the first user input, the one or more *additional media objects* each including a portion of a media clip in common with the first media object;
- receiving at least one of the one or more additional media objects;
- rendering the received additional media object;
- receiving a second user input regarding a second media object;
- sending a second request for one or more related media objects based on the second user input, the one or more *related media objects* comprising media objects that occur within a close temporal proximity of the second media object;
- receiving at least one of the one or more related media objects;
- rendering the received related media object;
- receiving a third user input regarding a third media object;
- sending a third request for one or more most-popular media objects based on the third user input, the one or more *most-popular media objects* comprising media objects having a higher frequency of repeat instances relative to one another;

- receiving at least one of the one or more most-popular media objects; and
- rendering the received most-popular media object.

In making out a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office alleges that Kenevsky and Geshwind render claim 13 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended this claim. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references at least fail to teach or suggest "***additional media objects*** each including a portion of a media clip in common with the first media object," "***related media objects*** comprising media objects that occur within a close temporal proximity of the second media object" and "***most-popular media objects*** comprising media objects having a higher frequency of repeat instances relative to one another," as recited in Applicant's amended claim. During the afore-mentioned interview, Applicant's attorney understood the Examiners to at least tentatively agree that if Applicant were to make such amendments to independent claim 13, the amended claim would at least overcome the cited references of record. However, the Examiners also indicated that they would need to re-review the references and, potentially, conduct an updated search. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 15-16 depend from claim 13 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 13 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest.

Claim 21 recites a system comprising (added language underlined and emphasis added):

- one or more processors; and
- a processor-readable storage medium, executable on the one or more processors, and comprising processor-executable instructions configured for:
 - receiving a request for information regarding a media object;
 - inferring the information from repeat instances of media objects occurring within one or more media streams; and
 - returning the information;
 - wherein the inferring comprises comparing temporal lengths of repeat instances of the media object with one another to determine different versions of the media object, the different versions of the media object selected from the group comprising:
 - a longest version of the media object;
 - a number of longer versions of the media object;
 - a shortest version of the media object; and
 - a number of shorter versions of the media object; and
 - wherein the inferring further comprises determining a number of related media objects, wherein: (i) the related media objects are determined based on temporal proximities of media objects relative to the media object associated with the request, and (ii) the related media objects have a higher frequency of repeat instances relative to one another.

In the pending Action, the Office rejects claim 21 under the same rationale used in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, Applicant herein amends claim 21 in a manner similar to the amendments to claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 stands allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in regards to claim 1.

Claims 22-27 depend from claim 21 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 21 apply equally to these claims. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-16 and 21-27 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: 2008/11/18

/Robert G. Hartman 58,970

Robert G. Hartman
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext. 265